/ 4	7
	•



## Interview Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/612,290	PATTERSON, JAMES D.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ramnandan Singh	2614	

The state of the s				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) <u>Ramnandan Singh, Examiner.</u> (3)				
(2) Paul J. Urbanski, Attorney for Applicant. (4)				
Date of Interview: <u>13 June 2007</u> .				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's	representative]			
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1 and 14</u> .				
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>NONE</u> .				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)☐ was not rea	iched. h) N/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)				
				THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.
·				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	xaminer's signature, if required			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Agreed to the following amendment:

- (i) Claim 1, line # 9, after "level" --, wherein the bias voltage is a function of a mismatch in transition times between the first and second output voltages- has been inserted.
  - (ii) Claim 14, lines # 5-6, delete "the cross-over voltage and the equidistant voltage".
  - (iii) Claim 14, line # 5, after "between" switching times of the first and second output voltages-has been inserted...